REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-40 have been rejected. Claims 7, 10, 15, 27, 30, and 35 have been amended, and claims 1-6 and 21-26 have been cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, Claims 7-20 and 27-40 remain pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 27 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner rejected the limitation "without usage of said source application" as unsupported by the specification.

In the Advisory Action dated September 28, 2007, mailed subsequently to the above-identified final Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejections of claim 27 and its dependents. Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections.

Claims 1 and 21 and their dependents have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of those claims have been obviated.

In response to the remaining rejections of claims 7, 15, and 35 and their dependents, Applicant has amended the claims to replace "without usage of said source application" with "independently of said source application." Support for Applicant's amendment may be found on page 9, lines 3-15 of the originally-filed Specification. That passage states that a self-contained representation has no "dependency beyond typical system services and generic utilities such as a browser." It follows that such a

self-contained representation would "enable viewing of the user interface displays independently of the source application", as is claimed by claims 7, 15, and 35.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7, 15, and 35 and their dependents are patentable under §112, first paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-40 were rejected under § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner rejected the claims for use of a negative limitation ("without usage of said source application") that rendered the claim indefinite because it was an attempt to claim the invention by excluding what the inventors did not invent rather than distinctly and particularly pointing out what they did invent.

In the Advisory Action dated September 28, 2007, mailed subsequently to the above-identified final Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejections of claim 27 and its dependents. Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections.

Claims 1 and 21 and their dependents have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of those claims have been obviated.

In response to the remaining rejections of claims 7, 15, and 35 and their dependents, Applicant has amended the claims to replace "without usage of said source application" with "independently of said source application." Support for Applicant's amendment may be found on page 9, lines 3-15 of the originally-filed Specification. Thus, Applicant no longer recites a negative limitation.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7, 15, and 35 and their dependents are patentable under §112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

- 10 -

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-14, 21-23, 26-27, and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,178,432 to Cook et al ("*Cook*").

Claims 1-3, 6, 21-23, and 26 are now cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of those claims are obviated.

As amended, claim 7 recites a method comprising:

"identifying, by a computing device, a format of a binary file generated by a source application;

selecting, by the computing device, a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file; and

processing, by the computing device, the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications, to enable viewing of the user interface displays independently of the source application."

In contrast, Cook does not teach or suggest at least the "selecting, by the computing device, a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file" claimed by amended claim 7. Rather, Cook discloses creation of a web page (which the Examiner reads on the self-contained representation of claim 7) through user interactions with an editor window (illustrated by Figure 6 of Cook and its corresponding description). The editor displays a series of objects, such as text and pictures, which a user may select for the web page. The user may also select structures, such as "Groups", to organize the selected objects. Cook further teaches

- 11 -

that a file, such as a Word Document, may be processed and output as a series of objects which the user may select to include in the web page.

Thus, Cook teaches away from claim 7 by directing the use of a user-interaction driven method of creating a web-page, not a format-based, specification-based approach, as is claimed in claim 7. Claim 7 requires that a computing device creating a self-contained representation must select a set of specifications based on the format of the binary file for which the self-contained representation is being created. For example, if the binary file of claim 7 is a Word document, claim 7 would require that the computing device select a set of specifications associated with the format of that Word document. In Cook, however, objects and their corresponding specifications (the Examiner reads the JavaScript specifying the objects as the "user interface display specifications" of claim 7) are selected based on user inputs, entirely irrespective of a format of any binary file. Accordingly, Cook simply does not teach or suggest "selecting, by the computing device, a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file."

§102 rejections require that the cited reference disclose the claimed invention in as complete of detail as is claimed. As remarked above, Cook fails to teach or suggest at least the "selecting" of claim 7. Thus, amended claim 7 is patentable over Cook under §102.

Amended claim 27 recites limitations similar to those of claim 7, directed to an apparatus of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 27 is patentable over Cook under §102 for at least the same reasons.

Claims 9-14 and 29-34 depend from claims 7 and 27, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly claims 9-14 and 29-34 are patentable over Cook under §102 for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, claim 11 further recites in part "wherein said processing ...[the binary file to generate a self-contained representation] ... further comprises ... simulating by the computing device user input(s) to said application based at least in part upon said selected set of user interface display specifications." Thus, claim 11 teaches a method of simulating user inputs based on a set of user interface display specifications in order as part of generating a self-contained representation. The portion of Cook cited by the Examiner as teaching "simulating", however, simply describes a user interacting with a deployed web page, the Examiner equating that web page to the "self-contained representation" of claims 7 and 11. Thus, the passages cited by the Examiner at best suggest simulated inputs (only user input, not simulated user input, is taught) *after* the self-contained representation has been generated. As recited by claim 11, however, the user inputs are simulated as part of the representation generating process. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to point out any portion of Cook that teaches or suggests the "simulating" of claim 11.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 15, 21, 27, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,272,484 to Martin et al. ("*Martin*").

Claims 1 and 21 are now cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of those claims are obviated.

Claims 7 and 27

In contrast to amended claim 7, Martin does not teach "identifying, by a computing device, a format of a binary file generated by a source application" or "selecting, by the computing device, a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file". Rather, Martin teaches a method of electronic

- 13 -

document/web page replication that is entirely agnostic as to the format of the electronic document (which the Examiner reads on the "binary file" of claim 7). While a user is browsing an electronic document, an image is captured of the document, and a thumbnail is created that is associated with both the location of the original electronic document and its image copy. At a subsequent time, a user may utilize the thumbnail to retrieve either the original electronic document or the image copy. The system may also provide image copies and the logic necessary to view them to, for example, an email recipient.

At no point in the creation of the image copies or the thumbnail does Martin disclose "identifying, by a computing device, a format of a binary file generated by a source application." As can be seen, all documents are treated identically (i.e., images are captured for all), so there is no reason to identify a format of the original electronic documents. It further follows that Martin does not teach "selecting, by the computing device, a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file" since the format of the electronic document is not identified and is irrelevant. Also, the only thing disclosed by Martin which could arguably read on "user interface display specifications", metadata associated with the image copy, is generated based on the content of the electronic document, not "selected … based … on the identified format" as is claimed in claim 7.

§102 rejections require that the cited reference disclose the claimed invention in as complete of detail as is claimed. As remarked above, Martin fails to teach at least the "identifying" and "selecting" of claim 7. Thus, amended claim 7 is patentable over Martin under §102.

Amended claim 27 recites limitations similar to those of claim 7, directed to an apparatus of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 27 is patentable over Martin under §102 for at least the same reasons.

<u>Claims 15 and 35</u>

Claim 15 recites limitations similar to those of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable over Martin for at least the same reasons. Additionally, Martin further fails to disclose "simulating, by the computing device, one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications", as is recited by claim 15. In Martin, the image copies (which the Examiner reads on the "self-contained representation" recited by claim 15) are generated responsive to user interactions with the electronic document. As such, there is no need to simulate input, since actual user input drives the generation of the image copies. Further, even if receiving such user interactions is mistakenly read upon "simulating ... user input", the receipt can in no way be said to be "based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications." As mentioned above, the only thing disclosed by Martin which could arguably read on "user interface display specifications", metadata associated with the image copy, is created in response to user interactions. Thus it is impossible for such user interactions to be based on that metadata.

§102 rejections require that the cited reference disclose the claimed invention in as complete of detail as is claimed. Martin fails to teach at least the "simulating" of claim 15. Thus, amended claim 15 is patentable over Martin under §102.

Amended claim 35 recites limitations similar to those of claim 15, directed to an apparatus of claim 15. Accordingly, claim 35 is patentable over Martin under §102 for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-5, 8, 15-20, 24-25, 28, and 35-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,178,432 to Cook et al ("*Cook*") in view of what was well known in the art.

- 15 -

Claims 4-5 and 24-25 are now cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of those claims are obviated.

As remarked above, Cook fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, Cook fails to teach or suggest at least the "selecting" of claim 7 and the "simulating" of claim 11. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to those claims. Claim 8 depends on claim 7, incorporating its limitations. Thus, claim 8 is also patentable over Cook for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 15 recites both the "selecting" of claim 7 and the "simulating" of claim 11. Thus, claim 15 is patentable over Cook for at least the same reasons that claims 7 and 11 are patentable over Cook.

Claim 35 recites limitations similar to those of claim 15, directed to an apparatus of claim 15. Accordingly, claim 35 is patentable over Cook for at least the same reasons.

Claims 16-20 and 36-40 depend from claims 15 and 35, incorporating their limitations respectively. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 16-20 and 36-40 are patentable over Cook.

- 16 -

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

</div>

Dated: October 24, 2007   /Robert C. Peck/
                                                     Robert Peck
                                                     Registration No. 56,826

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-796-2099